

# SAN FRANCISCO BAY CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

50 California Street • Suite 2600 • San Francisco, California 94111 • (415) 352-3600 • Fax: (415) 352-3606 • www.bcdc.ca.gov

November 19, 2013

**TO:** Design Review Board Members

**FROM:** Lawrence J. Goldzband, Executive Director (415/352-3653; lgoldzband@bcdc.ca.gov)  
Ellen Miramontes, Bay Design Analyst (415/352-3643; ellenm@bcdc.ca.gov)

**SUBJECT: Draft Minutes of October 7, 2013 BCDC Design Review Board Meeting**

1. **Call to Order and Attendance.** The Design Review Board's Chair, John Kriken, called the meeting to order at approximately 6:30 p.m. Other Design Review Board members in attendance included Cheryl Barton, Ephraim Hirsch, Roger Leventhal, Jacinta McCann and Gary Strang. BCDC staff in attendance included Bob Batha, Ellie Knecht, Brad McCrea, Ellen Miramontes, and Ming Yeung.

2. **Approval of Draft Minutes for August 5, 2013 and September 9, 2013 Meetings.** The Board approved the minutes from both of these meetings with no changes.

3. **Gateway Park, Gateway Park Working Group (First Review).** The Board conducted its first pre-application review of the proposed design for Gateway Park, a new regional park located near the east touchdown of the Bay Bridge in Oakland, Alameda County. This park would encompass 170 acres and include various parcels from the waterfront near the Bay Bridge touchdown to Mandela Parkway in West Oakland. The park would provide access to the shoreline, enhance bicycle and pedestrian connections to the new east span of the Bay Bridge and other local trails, include active and passive recreation opportunities, and highlight the natural, industrial maritime, and transportation history of the area. Public access proposed within the Commission's Bay and 100-foot shoreline band jurisdictions would include a boat launch area, a pier, open space and a variety of trails.

For a transcript of the meeting proceedings, including the BCDC staff introduction, the project presentation, Board questions, public comments, Board discussion and the applicant's response, please see the attached transcription.

a. **Board Summary and Conclusions**

(1) **Physical Access.** The Board expressed concern that the design overemphasizes bicycling as the dominant form of transportation and recreation. Emphasis on bicycles for transportation to and recreation within the park should be balanced with other means of arrival and movement. There was also a desire to better understand how park users will arrive at the park.

(2) **Visual Access.** The Board asked that there be an exploration of "primary views" to and from the park. It was also mentioned that open views should be maintained and that appropriately placed new trees could enhance views of the Bay.



*Making San Francisco Bay Better*

**DRB MINUTES**  
**October 7, 2013**

(3) **Proposed Park Amenities.** The proposed mix of passive and active uses is positive. There should be means to experiment with the park program over time in order for the most desirable uses to prevail in an iterative fashion. One member asked that the park have “one big unifying idea” and others advocated for a “less is more” approach to open space such as found at Crissy Field.

It was also discussed that the uses and development of the park in the “Key Point” area should be lighter and more natural, while heavier programming and development would be more appropriate in the “Bridgeyard” area.

The Board expressed mixed opinions on whether portions of the old East Span should be preserved in place. Some liked the concept of saving a “288” section while others expressed concern as to how it would be maintained and preferred the idea of a new fishing pier.

(4) **Water Access.** The Board requested more information regarding the proposed recreational water access including the kayak launch and beach area. They asked that a cross section of this area be provided.

(5) **Wildlife Compatibility.** Regarding the proposed trail to Radio Beach, there was a general consensus that it would be desired although careful consideration should be given to several aspects: the trail should be the minimum size needed and be moved away from the shoreline; the trail would likely need to be at a higher elevation in order to accommodate predicted sea level rise; and a gently sloping shoreline condition is preferred in this area.

Potential impacts on wildlife from raptors in tall trees or sculptures was raised. More information was requested on how habitat areas would be enhanced. The Board commented that the desired habitats should first be carefully considered and then the park should be designed to be compatible with those habitats.

(6) **Sea Level Rise.** The shoreline edge should be as natural as possible. Walls and riprap should be avoided as the use of hard structures leads to washing out sandy beaches. A gently sloped living shoreline is preferred. It was also mentioned that the proposed elevations may need to be adjusted higher.

4. **Adjournment.** Mr. Kriken adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

ELLEN MIRAMONTES  
Bay Design Analyst